

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

XIAOYE BAI,
 Plaintiff(s),
 v.
 REUBART, et al.,
 Defendant(s).

Case No.: 2:19-cv-00739-GMN-NJK

ORDER

[Docket No. 37]

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of the order denying his request for appointment of counsel. Docket No. 37; *see also* Docket No. 26 (order denying request for appointment of counsel). Defendants filed a response in opposition. Docket No. 38.

Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. Local Rule 59-1(b); *see also Koninklijke Philips Elecs. N.V. v. KXD Tech., Inc.*, 245 F.R.D. 470, 472 (D. Nev. 2007) ("Reconsideration is an extraordinary remedy, to be used sparingly" (citation and internal quotations omitted)). The Local Rules provide the applicable standards in addressing whether the Court should reconsider an interlocutory order, indicating that reconsideration may be appropriate if (1) there is newly discovered evidence that was not available when the original motion or response was filed, (2) the Court committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) there is an intervening change in controlling law. Local Rule 59-1(a).

In this case, Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration has added some additional detail, such as the fact that he has previously obtained help with legal filings from another inmate. Considering

1 the new arguments made, the Court is not persuaded that circumstances exist that would justify
2 reconsideration.

3 Accordingly, the motion for reconsideration is **DENIED**.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: January 27, 2021

6
7 
8 _____
9 Nancy J. Koppe
10 United States Magistrate Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28